THE
Dan Smoot Report

Vol. 15, No. 14 (Broadcast 711) April 7, 1969 Dallas, Texas

DAN SMOOT

Pornography In Classrooms Should Be Outlawed

The following is adapted from two issues of *Sacramento Report*, a newsletter to constituents written by California State Senator John G. Schmitz, and from a Senate Concurrent Resolution which Senator Schmitz has proposed to the Legislature:

A concerted drive is now under way to establish and promote public school sex-education programs which are frank to the point of outright pornography, and are not ordinarily accompanied by even a pretense of moral instruction. Some of the material now being used for sex education in California public schools approaches so close to pornography that parents have been forbidden to read it on the radio or even to distribute it to other parents' homes.

Local school districts in this State may include sex-education courses in their curriculum or not, as the individual school boards direct.

Though many California schools have not yet made sex education or "Family Life Education" courses mandatory, they have introduced sex-education material in other school subjects, such as "health" and even English, which are required for graduation.

Many children in this State are already being exposed, in the name of public education, to material which could undermine and destroy the moral foundations of their lives. Entire sex-education courses have been required of all pupils in several public schools in San Mateo County. This may be expected to become the practice in a rapidly increasing number of California schools.

Many who support sex-education programs in the public schools argue that instruction in the facts about sex will reduce sexual immorality. This is incredibly naive. Without moral instruction, sex education — especially the kind now promoted — is much more likely to encourage violations of moral law.

Some promoters of sex education in schools seem to regard sexual morality as something impor-

THE DAN SMOOT REPORT is published weekly by The Dan Smoot Report, Inc., Box 9538, Dallas, Texas 75214 (office at 6441 Gaston Ave.). Subscriptions: $18.00 for 2 years; $10.00, 1 year; $6.00, 6 months. Dan Smoot was born in Missouri, reared in Texas. With BA and MA degrees from SMU (1938 and 1940), he joined the Harvard faculty (1941) as a Teaching Fellow, doing graduate work in American civilization. From 1942 to 1951, he was an FBI agent; from 1951 to 1955, a commentator on national radio and television. In 1955, he started his present independent, free-enterprise business: publishing this REPORT and abbreviating it each week for radio and TV broadcasts available for commercial sponsorship by business firms.

Copyright by Dan Smoot, 1969. Second Class mail privilege authorized at Dallas, Texas.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tant only to certain church groups and to people with what they contemptuously call "puritanical" ideas. On the contrary, the preservation of some fundamental standards of sexual morality is essential to the survival of nations. History has many examples of nations and civilizations which fell after widespread abandonment of the moral standards which had helped control sexual behavior.

Sex education (involving the most intimate and personal aspects of family life, and the fundamental religious convictions of family members) should not be forced on children against the will of their parents.

Voluntary community programs (divorced from public school systems, conducted by private individuals and organizations, and utilizing all available professional help) could be productive of much good in teaching parents how to handle sex education for their children. But sex education as such should not be allowed in public schools.

When a state assumes — as all states have — the authority to force parents to send their children to school, the state should go further and protect them against exposing their children to instruction that is morally abhorrent to the parents. Atheists, moral nihilists, and other subversives have found, in the federal courts, "protection" against having their children exposed to religious principles and religiously-based moral ideals in public schools. The least that other parents should demand is protection against exposing their children to pornography, immorality, and perversion.

The only sensible alternative to giving parents this kind of state protection is to abolish all compulsory tax-supported schools.

When enough Americans come to realize that compulsory, tax-supported (government) schools are a profoundly significant violation of the principles of liberty, all such government schools will be abolished; and parents will be left free to support and patronize the kinds of schools they want their children to attend. Then, neither local, state, nor federal governments will have any excuse for prescribing school curricula.

Until that ideal condition exists, however, every state legislature should prohibit sex education in public schools. To leave the door open—for "proper" sex education, or for local option to give non-compulsory sex education — is dangerous. When the door is left open for sex education, there is no sure way to keep out the deviates and other sodden-minded individuals who would like to become "sex teachers."

All federal aid to schools should be stopped, for many reasons — the most important being that it is unconstitutional. With specific reference to sex education in schools, a good reason for stopping federal aid is that, without it, most school systems could not afford the harmful sex-education programs they are conducting or planning.

Federal tax exemption for such organizations as SIECUS (Sex Information and Education Council of the U.S.) should be withdrawn, on the grounds that SIECUS is not really a "health organization," but a promoter of pornography and juvenile delinquency.

These, of course, are "impractical" suggestions. There is no hope, in the near future, of closing all government schools and returning to a system of private and church schools. There is little likelihood that state legislatures will soon outlaw all sex education in public schools. There is no immediate possibility of getting the national Congress to stop all illegal federal aid to education. And the U. S. Treasury Department is not likely to withdraw the privilege of tax exemption from SIECUS.

But we can make an important beginning by supporting efforts now being made in some state legislatures, and by encouraging other state legislatures to follow suit.

In the State of Washington, on January 8, 1969, Senator Sam C. Guess filed two bills: SB 60, which would prohibit Washington State public schools from testing, quizzing, or surveying students (without written parental consent) about their

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

personal or family beliefs or practices in sex, morality, religion, and the like; and SB 61, which would prohibit public schools (unless they have written parental consent) from giving students instructions in human sexuality or human sex relationships.

In California, on February 25, 1969, State Senator John G. Schmitz introduced Senate Bill No. 413 to prohibit *compulsory* sex education in the elementary and secondary schools of California. Assemblymen E. Richard Barnes and John L. E. Collier are co-authors of SB 413.

The Bill provides that the human reproductive organs, and their functions and processes, may not be described, illustrated or discussed in any public school class which children are required to attend. Classes including such material may be held only for children whose parents request them in writing. At least thirty days before any such class is begun, all written or audio-visual material to be used in it must be available for inspection by any parent of a child attending the school in which the class is given.

There is enormous, nationwide interest in this subject. Senator Schmitz has received mail from as far away as New Jersey, asking information on what he is trying to do to prevent public school sex education from undermining the morality of a whole generation of Californians.

Some have asked him why his SB 413 does not abolish sex education altogether. Personally, Senator Schmitz objects to any sex education in the public schools. As a State Legislator, however, he is guided by his belief that control of public schools should be exercised at the *local*, not at the *state*, level. He feels that state intervention — to the extent of prohibiting local districts from making sex education compulsory — is justified, because the state has already intervened by forcing parents to send their children to school.

The California State Constitution prescribes "moral improvement" as one of the purposes of public schools. Some current sex-education material seems obviously to promote immorality. Consequently, there may be constitutional justification in California for legislation more restrictive than Senator Schmitz's SB 413. Realizing this, Senator Schmitz introduced two other measures (on February 25, 1969):

(1) Senate Resolution No. 99, asking for a full legislative committee investigation of objections and charges made against current public school sex-education programs, to determine whether such programs conflict with the "moral improvement" provision of the Constitution; and

(2) Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 60 (of which Assemblymen Barnes and Collier are co-authors), requesting local school boards throughout the State to refrain from implementing any new programs of sex education or "family life education" (whether as part of a course so named or of any other course) until the legislative committee investigation is completed (on or before the fifth legislative day of the 1970 Regular Session of the Legislature).

There is also something that *can* be done (and has been proposed) at the federal level. Corrupting youth with sex education in schools is related to the general flooding of our society with hard-core pornography — through films, plays, magazines, books. The salacious *Playboy* magazine has even set up a Playboy Foundation "to implement the principles of the Playboy philosophy," arranging for it to get tax-free contributions through the Hugh M. Hefner Foundation which has exemption from federal taxation.

All of this debauching of our population is being done under the protection of the Supreme Court whose decisions have made it impossible for local and state authorities to defend the public against the national flood of obscenity.

Consequently, the public should vigorously support a piece of federal legislation (S 1077, introduced by Senator Everett McK. Dirksen) which would prohibit all federal courts from reviewing jury verdicts and state court decisions in cases

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

involving state prosecution of violations of state obscenity laws.

Another thing individuals can do — more difficult and more demanding than supporting remedial legislation but a great deal more important — is to get involved.

Parents who themselves behave as if the human body were a brothel and not a temple are not concerned about raw sex education in schools. A few actively support it because they expect promiscuity in youth and believe that sex education will help prevent venereal disease and unwanted pregnancy. Others accept it because they vapidly preen themselves on being "open-minded" about anything called "modern" or "progressive." Some timidly feel that parents should not question educational experts, while others fear bringing disapproval or scorn upon themselves or their children. Others are so eager to avoid parental responsibility that they are willing for the school to do anything it pleases as long as they are not called upon to do something. A great many are selfishly indifferent, unwilling to be bothered or distracted from their sensual pleasures.

But most Americans still unconcerned about such critically important issues as sex education in schools are in that condition because they are uninformed. It is the responsibility of those who know and care to educate the uneducated.

It is not an easy job; but, if we are to save an entire generation of children, the job must be done — and it can be done.

Many constitutional conservatives seem to be waiting and yearning for one dynamic national leader to come along and save the Republic. But the great, charismatic spokesman they dream of will never be produced, nor the Republic ever saved, until the way has been prepared by the multiplied efforts of many dedicated individuals who, like Deacon Larkin's horse, will remain anonymous in history.

Use this series of five *Dan Smoot Reports* (Vol. 15, Nos. 10-14, available at prices listed below) to inform other Americans about sex education in our schools. There is also available a considerable quantity of additional useful material on the subject. U.S. Representative John Rarick has put important information in the *Congressional Record*. Mrs. Barbara Richards, 14641 Charloma Drive, Santa Ana, California 92701 (a parent who has made a determined fight against sex education in schools) has published an informative booklet (available directly from her for 35¢). For prices and availability of other excellent materials on this subject, write Christian Crusade (Box 977, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74102), Radio Church of the Air (P. O. Box 1144, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73101), and American Opinion (Belmont, Massachusetts 02178).

Subscribe Today to The Dan Smoot Report

6 mos. $6.00 – **1 YR. $10.00** – 2 yrs. $18.00

THE DAN SMOOT REPORT
BOX 9538, DALLAS, TEXAS 75214
Telephone: TAylor 1-2303

Send reprints to your friends and suggest they order reprints too.
REPRINTS OF THIS ISSUE (for bulk mailing to one address):

1 copy	$ .25	100 copies	$6.50
10 copies	1.00	200 copies	12.00
25 copies	2.00	500 copies	28.00
50 copies	3.50	1000 copies	50.00

Texans Add 4% for Sales Tax
(Add 50c for special-handling postage)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED